

introduced it and have carried it through to success.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). In rising to address the House upon the very important question that we have been discussing for the last few days, allow me, before I enter into any of the arguments of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), to make a few remarks with respect to what was said by the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig). I find, Sir, that that hon. gentleman, in addressing the House, said the workingman was not taxed either on what he eats or on what he wears. He stated that the farmer had a free breakfast table. But, in saying so he forgot to tell this House, and through this House the country, that the table itself was taxed to the tune of 35 per cent, that the chair upon which the man sits at his breakfast is taxed 35 per cent. He also forgot to say that the flour that might be made from his own wheat was taxed 75 cents a barrel, and that the workingman also has to pay this tax. He forgot to say that when the workingman rises in the morning and goes to wash himself, the soap he uses is taxed 14 cents per pound, or something like 30 per cent. He forgot to tell you that the towel also was taxed 25 per cent. He forgot to say that if he had a comb to straighten his hair, it was taxed to the tune of 35 per cent, and, if he had a looking-glass, it also was taxed. His sugar is taxed, his coffee is taxed, almost everything that goes upon the workingman's table is taxed, except what comes directly from the farmer. The blankets that the workingman uses when he goes to bed are taxed from 40 to 60, 70 and even 80 per cent. The clothes of the workingman and his family, which cost something like \$90 per annum, represent a tax of over \$30. His coal oil is taxed. And yet they will tell the workingman that he is free of taxation on what he eats and what he wears. I suppose that in their explanation, gentlemen opposite would say that the workingmen ought not to wear any of the finer tweeds of the goods coming from the old country, that the goods he ought to wear are goods of Canadian manufacture. Let me remind the hon. gentlemen that the Canadian manufacturer is benefited upon his cotton goods and upon his woollen goods to the whole extent of the protection. The merchant going to the old country purchasing goods and bringing them into Canada, pays a duty upon woollen goods of an average of 30 to 40 per cent. Upon cotton goods he pays a duty of from 24 to nearly 40 per cent, and before these goods reach the workingmen the duty is represented by an increased cost of 40 to 60 per cent. And yet they tell us that the workingmen pay no duty. Let me say, Sir, that the

only difference between the goods imported into this country from Britain and the United States, is that the individual purchasing foreign goods in Canada has got to pay the whole amount of the duty along with the price of the goods, while there is little under 2 per cent of freight and insurance to be added to the price of Canadian goods put upon the market. That is all the advantage the workingman gets; he has got to pay the whole cost of the goods and the amount of duty added. I was astonished at the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig) stating that he was in favour of the duty being removed from coal oil, and what reason did he give for the Government not removing that duty? Why, he told us that there were several millions of money invested, and that we could not see this money swept away. I would ask: Where did the manufacturers get these millions of money to invest? We know that the oil industry is not a new industry in Canada, that it has been established for a length of time, and we know that those who have been engaged in that business have all become independent as regards their pecuniary circumstances. He stated, also, that there were 2,000 workingmen engaged in that business, and they would all be thrown out of employment at once. They accuse us of decrying Canada; was there ever a stronger statement made in this House to show, either that Canada is not naturally fitted for carrying on that industry, or for taking the raw material and manufacturing coal oil, or that our workingmen are not as intelligent, not as energetic, as the Americans, and therefore not able to cope with them? I hold that if we take this view of the question, we will never sweep away a single item of the National Policy, because all the different industries can come forward and say that they have large amounts of money invested, and a large number of workingmen employed. Is that any reason why the consumers of this country should be taxed to the tune of 134 and 135 per cent upon coal oil? Is it any reason why the raw material should be protected to the tune of nearly 1,000 per cent? Sir, I hold that the argument adduced by the hon. gentleman is no argument whatever. The workingmen of Canada to-day pay a duty annually to this Government, on account of the National Policy, of between \$30 and \$40 if not more, when we take into account everything they consume in their houses, and that is a grievous burden upon the workingmen of this country. There is not a single hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who has had the hardihood to rise and say that the National Policy has increased the per capita wages of the workingmen. They have stated that some \$40,000,000 have been given as wages to the artisans of this country. I hold that the artisans in this country is not as well off to-day as he was before the National Policy was imposed. Now, I will take up the statements